

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 9-26 and 35-36 were pending. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claim 36 is allowed. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoll et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,925,156) in view of Yoshimura (U.S. Patent No. 6,019,461) and, as applicable, in further view of either Briedis et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,510,951) or Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,910,890). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 13-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Sasaki (JP 58005438) and claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Sasaki in further view of Bartsch (U.S. Patent No. 5,687,050). In response, Applicant has amended claim 13 to further define the invention and cancelled claims 1-7 and 9-12. Therefore, claims 13-26 and 35-36 remain pending.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview on June 26, 2007. During the interview, proposed language to claim 13, as suggested by the Examiner (Office Action, page 13, second paragraph), was discussed to further define the placement of the analog switch within the circuit. Although no agreement was reached, the Examiner agreed to consider the proposed claim language and to review the proposal with his supervisor. Consistent with this interview, Applicant has amended claim 13 herein to include that the analog switch is “disposed between a voltage divider circuit and a comparator.” Applicant respectfully submits that neither Hansen nor Sasaki teach or suggest this limitation. Indeed, the Sasaki reference (relied upon by the Examiner for teaching an analog switch) teaches a switch disposed between a differentiating circuit and an arithmetic unit (Sasaki, Figure 1), not an analog switch disposed between a voltage divider circuit and a comparator, as required by amended claim 13. Therefore, Applicant

respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the proposed amendment to claim 13 and to pass this case to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 65783-0035 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to such deposit account number.

Dated: July 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shelly L. Hokenstad/

Glenn E. Forbis

Registration No.: 40,610

Shelly L. Hokenstad

Registration No.: 59,107

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 10291

Attorneys for Applicant

R042259